

# CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION

Volume 1, No. 13

July 28, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

## The Mirage of Mediation

ONE feature of American Protestantism is peculiarly baffling to Christians in other lands. It is the fact that this people, in many respects so hard-headed, so shrewd, should also be so readily captivated by illusory panaceas in the practical realities of world affairs.

This is no novel appearance. It has characterized the attitudes of large sections of the churches' leadership for half a century. A careful examination of the hopes of that leadership as disclosed in formal pronouncements of church assemblies and in the columns of leading religious journals is as depressing an assignment as could be proposed for doctoral research. It is a record of undiscouraged advocacy of successive panaceas for the world's ills, many of them with little relation to the actualities of the situation and with virtually no possibility of fulfillment.

In the last war, though the "Ford Peace Ship" was initiated by one with little connection with the church, it won its support largely among earnest Christian folk. For months, they were encouraged to lodge their hopes in this Peter Pan project and thus to evade the bitter realities of that struggle. Yet every competent authority knew from the moment of the project's initiation that it could have no bearing on the outcome.

In the decade following Versailles, one recalls the ecstatic panegyrics with which the Pact of Paris was hailed as the guarantor of permanent world peace—as though the mere affixing of signatures could transform age-old habits of appeal to force, unless implemented by adequate instruments of international government and police. But many of those who claimed the Kellogg Pact as harbinger of a millennium refused American support for the League of Nations which alone could have given the Pact effect.

Through the past decade of ever-deepening crisis, the "peace programs" of this leadership have had less and less contact with the actualities of the situation. They have talked of progressive disarmament in a world daily arming to the teeth. They have proposed to bring to bear the influence of "world conscience" through "world organization" in a world which had

long since lost commonly accepted moral standards and whose only instrument of world organization, the League, was steadily slipping into ever more pathetic impotence. They have called for settlement by conference in a world in which the method of conference had ceased to hold practical meaning. The flight from reality reached its climax in their advocacy, two years and a half ago, of a "world economic conference." There was no possibility that such a conference could have been held or that, if it had assembled, it could have turned back the plunging torrent of events. Yet thousands of sincere American Christians were deceived into fastening their hopes for preservation of peace upon this mirage. Of a piece was the proposal urged all through the first year of the European struggle that President Roosevelt should lead the "other neutrals" in summoning the belligerents to a peace table.

### II

It is against this background that the present campaign for "peace through mediation" must be viewed. Both in its underlying psychology and its practical significance, it is strikingly parallel to the Ford Peace Ship. It is the last and most tragic episode in a dogged pursuit of panaceas. To an incredulous world, it seems a peculiarly vivid illustration of American Utopianism. It would be difficult to take it seriously were it not for the distinction of its proponents and the certainty that, like its predecessors, this mirage will delude many eager lovers of peace within the churches.

We also long for the restoration of peace.

We are no less zealous for the achievement of a just and enduring settlement through negotiation. Let it be clearly understood that there is no difference on that point. But a peace to which the Christian conscience could give approval presupposes certain specific conditions. The negotiators must come to the peace table as truly authorized spokesmen of the peoples whose fate is to be determined. They must be profoundly committed to the writing of a just, and therefore durable, peace. They must be men

whose word can be trusted. The peace must guarantee not merely cessation of hostilities but also release from subjugation and restoration to liberty of those peoples who desired only peace, who committed no provocation to aggression, but who today endure slavery beneath the Nazi yoke.

None of those conditions is present. Hitler would come to the "peace table" as master of most of Europe. He would come as the overwhelming victor thus far in the struggle. He would be in position to dictate far more tyrannous terms than he imposed at Munich, upon Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, or the Balkans. Whatever the terms to which he might affix his signature, that signature would have the worth of the philosophy of treaty-making blatantly proclaimed in *Mein Kampf* and faithfully practiced through a decade of duplicity, betrayal and violated pledges. There can be no possibility of peace until the enslavers of Europe are overthrown and succeeded by men committed to world order grounded in justice who shall speak authentically in behalf of peace-loving peoples of all nations. To talk of "negotiating" a sufferable peace with these conquerors or of the United States in the role of "mediator" is to wrest great words from any meaning which Christians can recognize.

### III

How are we to explain this strange phenomenon among American Christians? In part, it springs

from certain features of our situation—our relative distance from the tension of nations, our comparative inexperience in the international realm. But explanation must be sought at a deeper level. It must be seen not only against our distinctive background but also in the perspective of an age-old and ineradicable weakness of the religious consciousness—its penchant for panaceas, its flight from reality which beget millennialism in every age and, in every period of conflict, breed fevered apocalypses. At times of darkness, these tendencies within the religious consciousness, always present, are greatly aggravated. In Europe there is a recrudescence of millennialism, of adventism, of resort to astrology and prophecy. Characteristically, the American counterpart cries for peace when there is no peace.

Let us recall that the "peace" which we are invited to advocate would not concern primarily the people of the United States. Rather, it would determine for the long future the fate of subjugated Europe. There is room for honest difference of view as to the course our nation should pursue, and as to the relation of Christians to national action. There is no place for a propaganda which encourages Christians in hopes which are without foundation. It is to enlist them in support of a fate for millions of their fellow men from which every Christian conscience must recoil. As the people of our churches come to understand the true meaning of the course to which they are urged, we believe they will reject it as a proposal with which they can have no part.

## Russia in the World Crisis

SHERWOOD EDDY

THE invasion of the Soviet Union and the entrance of Russia into the war brings a grave danger but also a great possible asset to the democracies. It may, in fact, mark the turning point of the entire conflict. No army in the world today can long withstand a land attack of the full force of the German army and its panzer divisions. Certainly France, Britain, Belgium and Holland did not, nor could the army of Britain or of the United States do so today, were it not for the protection of their ocean barriers. As shown in its invasion of Finland, the Russian Army had been weakened by the long-continued purges, the backwardness of production in Soviet industry and agriculture, and utterly inadequate railway transportation. The Russians individually and collectively are brave and stubborn fighters but they are woefully lacking in modern equipment. When I was

in Spain I found that man for man and plane for plane the Russians stood up well against the Germans, but characteristically the German General Staff scientifically studied that war as did no other army in the world and perfected its equipment and technique. Today the Soviets' cumbrous tanks and planes are naturally inferior to those of highly industrialized, thoroughly prepared, war-minded, efficient Germany.

I was in Moscow and the Ukraine in 1939 just before the outbreak of the war, on my fifteenth visit to Russia—twice in Czarist times, the remainder under the present regime. I was convinced that the German-Russian Pact was a temporary neutrality agreement between enemies who would one day have to fight it out between themselves. Chamberlain probably hoped in the Munich appeasement that he had

purchased immunity for Britain and France, and that Germany and Russia would partly destroy each other in the war, leaving Britain again supreme. So Stalin, perhaps equally short-sighted, hoped that he had purchased immunity and neutrality for the Soviet Union, while Germany might destroy Britain and France but leave herself too exhausted to attack Russia. Certainly Hitler's offer to Stalin was far more attractive and hopeful than that of Chamberlain who was always friendly to Franco and the Fascists and deeply hostile to Soviet Communism. It must never be forgotten that as soon as Hitler broke every promise and seized the whole of Czechoslovakia, it was the Soviet Union alone that proposed a conference and an alliance to stop Hitler and it was Chamberlain's Tory Government that opposed this plan. But America at least, long isolationist, cannot criticize isolationist Russia.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union has always consistently sought security. In 1922 at Rapallo the Allies' outcast pariahs, defeated Germany and communist Russia, were forced to get together. Then Russia, fearing invasion, entered into a military alliance with the powerful army of France, until France, under the reactionary leadership of Laval and the two hundred rich families, proved to be a broken reed. Then the Soviet Union, still seeking collective security, entered the League and for five years loyally supported it. When the League, which had been let down and weakened in turn by the United States, Japan, Mussolini, and Hitler, was finally betrayed by its two chief supporters, Britain and France, Russia changed its policy and dismissed Litvinov. After the failure of Chamberlain's half-hearted, suspicious and hostile negotiations, Hitler made his seemingly more favorable offer where a neutral Russia left in peace could prepare for the probable invasion of the Nazis or capitalist nations. In all these negotiations the Soviet Union always consistently sought security and peace.

When Hitler launched his recent unprovoked attack upon the Soviet Union it was my conviction that at great sacrifice in man power and in equipment, Hitler could take what he chose of the regions around Leningrad, Moscow and the Ukraine. Then will come the crisis of the war. If, after humiliating defeat, Russia can save the bulk of her armies, with whatever loss of equipment, and Stalin, the General Staff, the workers and peasants, have the will to fight on as Britain, or China has done, it will mark, in the writer's opinion, the beginning of the ultimate defeat and downfall of Hitler. If, on the other hand, Russia follows the example of France, if in cowardly compromise and appeasement Stalin signs another Pact practically surrendering to Hitler the control of the enormous resources and man power of the disarmed Soviet Union, it will mean Hitler's greatest

victory. The Nazis can then at leisure take the whole Mediterranean area—Syria, Irak, Iran, and Palestine—then God help the Jews! They can conquer Egypt, the Suez Canal, and in time, Gibraltar, if they want it, and North Africa. Hitler can then march his legions overland and with his army and air force will command the approaches to Asia, Africa, and Latin America. He can take Dakar and the Cape Verde Islands—unless America, no longer divided, confused, and unawakened, takes them first. Within six or seven hours' flight of South America, with thousands of able, adroit, well-financed Germans in key positions all over that southern continent, Hitler could then foment internal revolutions and take country after country in Latin America. The United States would be left a vast island of democracy amid Hitler's slave states spending most of its reduced income on armament and forced to barter with Hitler partly on his own terms.

On returning to Russia on my last visit I found it the most fascinating yet the most irritating country in the world. Everywhere there was tension and suspicion due to the purge. According to the totals announced in their own press in *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and forty local papers, the Soviet Government had found it necessary to shoot some 2,500 of their own leaders as "Trotskyites and wreckers" within two years. There were restrictions on all sides and practically all foreigners were under suspicion. We must remember, however, that during the similar period in the French Revolution some 17,000 were executed, hundreds of thousands were imprisoned, others had been massacred, or had disappeared, while 150,000 were on the list of emigres, liable to instant death if they returned to France.

Economically the Soviets had been slowly and painfully gaining in production up to Hitler's invasion, though there was always a lag behind the difficult goals of the five-year plans owing to the inexperience of the peasants in industry, the waste of an over-centralized bureaucracy, the diversion of much of their energy to armament, and the loss of probably half or more of their leaders in the purge, whether by death, exile, or removal. One of the best informed and most objective Russians living today, who is both sympathetic with, yet critical of, Stalin's regime, estimates that about half a million former leaders are gone. Stalin glories in the training of half a million new proletarian leaders in government, in industry, in agriculture, in education, and in the army. But that probably means that an equivalent number of the old leaders of Lenin's day have been sacrificed.

Whatever may be the material achievements of the Soviet Union there are in the system essential evils that have always made it for me morally impossible: There is a denial or severe abridgment of political



and civil liberties. There is an emphasis upon violence, which is considered as absolutely necessary, and at times as almost desirable in itself. This has led already to three successive purges within two decades, with their multitudes of victims. Until the Soviets really grant the liberty promised in their third Constitution and trust an open, honest opposition without shooting such opponents, this firm faith in harsh violence with the destruction of all "enemies" seems to threaten yet other purges in the future, for tyranny always breeds "treason." And, finally, there is a harsh dogmatism and dogmatic atheism in the communist system very painful for an Anglo-Saxon who is accustomed to complete religious liberty and toleration. It is true that there are enough churches open for the surviving worshippers of the Greek Orthodox Church who wish to attend services of worship, but every prophetic voice is instantly silenced in Russia and religion has never faced such intelligent and implacable foes in all history as Communism and Nazism. No one can be a member of the Communist Party, nor of the Leninist Youth Movement, who is not practically a dogmatic atheist.

Religion still survives in Russia, however, especially among the older generation. In 1939 I attended the service in one of eighteen open churches in Moscow which had never been closed. Here the Christians reported an average attendance of some two hundred every night in the week and every night in the year, with over a thousand every Saturday night and Sunday morning. Yaroslavsky, the head of the Militant Godless Society, informed us officially that there were in 1939 30,000 registered religious societies in the U. S. S. R. He said that although two-thirds of the workers in the city and one-third of the peasants in the country were out of touch with the organized churches, they had not necessarily abandoned personal religion. However long-suffering and devout the worshippers in these churches obviously are, the Greek Orthodox Church is still for the most part unreformed and often sadly ignorant and superstitious. But it is my conviction that when liberty comes to this land, or is won by the people, vital religion of some reformed type will return in power to Russia.

In the light of this titanic, costly experiment of twenty-four years in Soviet Russia, we may profitably re-evaluate Karl Marx and see more clearly the mistakes made by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. In my judgment, Marx made his first mistake when in his embittered heart he placed such emphasis upon ruthless violence in the inevitable revolution and in the elimination of the hated bourgeoisie. Again, Marx believed that the Reality of the Universe is organic but not super-organic. There is no place in his system for God. He was dogmatic in temperament

though not in the theory of his dialectic, and it became natural for the Marxian Communist Party and the Youth Movement to be identified with harsh, dogmatic atheism, zealously seeking the final elimination of religion from life. Illogically, with an unconscious theological bias, Marx believed that the stars in their courses were fighting for justice and the ultimate revolution. This is of course illogical if there is no intelligent purpose or benevolence behind the material universe.

The experience of the Soviet Union enables us to test Marxian theory by the Russian experiment. In general that experience seems to show that Marxism is essentially correct in its economic theory. It appears, however, to be wrong in its theory of the state, its estimate of human nature and its belief in the dialectic process as an iron law of necessity in the universe. Marx held that the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production would abolish the two conflicting owning and dependent classes and thus introduce an economically classless society where the state as the instrument of class domination would "wither away." Marx himself, unconscious of wishful thinking, was able to find a system that contained all his desires and a universe that was cooperating with him. He imagined that he had discovered by strictly scientific processes the laws which made the ultimate victory of the proletariat practically demonstrable. There was in his system, however, a residue of quasi-religious faith which he did not recognize. His prophetic vision was a secularized version of the oft-repeated apocalyptic vision of a redeemed society for the disinherited classes. Marx had thus read his own revolutionary purpose into the structure of the universe. He assumes as a religious faith, without the necessity of proof, that the world is evolving of its own necessary motion by a dialectic procedure "from the lower to the higher," to install a reign of justice, "with iron necessity." This is not science but religion.

Lenin also made a grave mistake when he told his followers to enter the trade unions, not to strengthen them but at the psychological moment to disrupt them, overthrow the national government, and precipitate the inevitable violent revolution. He says: "Great problems in the lives of nations are solved *only by force.*" Only that is right which aids the revolution and that is wrong which hinders it. Every Communist and fellow traveler from the time of Marx and Lenin to the present has a single and alien loyalty. This loyalty is not to his country, it is not to God or humanity, but only to the proletarian revolution and to Soviet Russia which incarnates it. Therefore the Communist and fellow traveler, however excellent his general character, is always loyal to the ever-changing Party line. He is under no obligation to tell the truth unless it aids his cause.

He can never be trusted in any trade union, or teachers' union, or strike, or other movement to be loyal to our cause if it differs from his own.

Following Marx and Lenin, Stalin made his mistakes also. With cold, implacable hatred he eliminated every Trotskyite and every suspect. After recent visits to the Soviet Union and after a study of the verbatim reports of the Moscow trials, I came to the conclusion that most of the Trotskyists placed on trial were actually guilty, as Radek was, but that they had not committed all the heinous and unbelievable crimes detailed in their grovelling confessions. As Trotsky in Mexico used his mock trial as a sounding board to vent his venomous hatred of Stalin, so Stalin used the Moscow trials to justify himself in his bitter hatred of Trotsky. Men like the brilliant general, Tukaichevsky, who would not confess, were shot in secret without public trial. Those who would confess to everything that they had or had not done, were used on the stage of the trials to glorify Stalin's revolution before the people and incriminate themselves as monsters.

Stalin made another mistake in the *method* of the invasion of Finland. He had every reason to fear such an invasion of Russia as Hitler has now made and there was a natural desire to remove the Finnish border beyond artillery range of Leningrad. But it was the falsehood of a provincial which based that invasion on the Finns' avowed purpose to invade and conquer Russia as far as the Ural Mountains. Stalin made his next mistake when he signed the Pact with Hitler which, however it seemed justified at the moment to meet the Soviets' primary need of security, gave Hitler the green light to go ahead and conquer practically all of continental Europe, finally including Russia itself.

It would be unfair to emphasize only what seem to be the evils in Soviet Russia and to be silent concerning the significance of this great experiment. Twenty-four years is too short a time in which to judge a total revolution. At the similar stage of the French Revolution, liberty, equality, and fraternity seemed to have been betrayed. Napoleon, the Mussolini or Hitler of his day, as the leader of reaction, was at the height of his power. But those great ideals of the French Revolution were deathless and some day were destined to be fulfilled in a freer world. I believe it will be the same in the case of the Soviet Union. As I see it, there are two major political and economic experiments in the world today—the Soviet experiment, based on the principle of justice, and the Anglo-Saxon experiment in liberty. The Soviets' ideal and aim is justice, without much liberty. America has its unemployment—apart from the present war boom in munitions—its slums, its segregated Negroes, and its impoverished sharecroppers with an average per capita income of from \$38 to \$87 a year,

or ten to twenty-five cents a day, with a third of the population ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed. Here we have liberty without much justice for the underprivileged. In my judgment, neither system can succeed nor should succeed as it is today. I believe that each will make its contribution to the new world that we must build, if we are ever to have a lasting peace based upon justice. Frankly I believe it will be even harder for America to demand and to give justice to all than it will be for Soviet Russia to give liberty. This is a hard saying but I believe that economic justice will be almost as impossible under the system of "rugged individualism" of capitalist America, as liberty under Stalin's totalitarian dictatorship.

At several points I believe that Soviet Russia, with all its titanic and barbaric evils, if it is true to its own ideals, will yet challenge the world and will make history: Here is a country that has dared to socialize or share all means of production, all land and all wealth, and yet has succeeded to the extent that unemployment has for years been eliminated, and, they believe, forever. Here is a nation that seeks to give approximately equal justice to all, in order to end permanently poverty, slums and glaring injustice. Here is a land which is seeking to build a classless society where there shall be neither rich nor poor, Jew nor Gentile, white nor black, and where already there is less race and color prejudice than in any nation in the world. Who knows but that in some better, distant day even the "Christian" nations may rise above race and color prejudice and may be willing to grant equal justice to *all* their peoples?

In my judgment, isolated, divided, materialistic, unawakened America is not simply contemplating a World War which will last for several years but we are entering a world revolution that will almost certainly last for several decades. God's judgments are abroad in the earth today. The old world of political imperialism and economic injustice must come under the judgment of God and be found wanting, and a new world must be built upon the foundations of justice, liberty, economic security, and cooperative brotherhood.

In conclusion let us remember that America has one and only one enemy in this war. It is Hitler and Nazism that now menaces America and the world. As between democracy and the Nazi ideology of brutal conquest and slave states, we have cast our weight for democracy. Though we have not yet been forced to enter a "shooting war," all who oppose the Nazis are democracy's Allies or Associated Powers and we should render them all possible aid. And if we are true to democracy we should be loyal to our own democratically-elected Government. It may be more romantic to praise Britain's colorful Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, at a distance, and to blame our own President for everything except the

weather. As Mr. Wendell Willkie well reminds us, however, we have but one democratically-elected President. Rightly or wrongly he has chosen to fight for democracy both at home and abroad—I believe rightly. Whatever our opinions and whatever our economic class, we should not allow our country to be divided, weakened and finally betrayed as was France, by unconscious fascists, fifth columnists, ap-

peasers, defeatists, and isolationists. If we believe in democracy let us support it and our President. Franklin Roosevelt is not yet as much maligned as were Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson by their contemporaries. If Roosevelt is true to his own ideals, and if the democracies win this war, posterity may not be ashamed of him as it has not been of them.

## A Letter from France

*We present the following analysis of the French situation by a Frenchman who is still in France.*

- the Editors.

Our foreign friends must experience some difficulties in imagining the true state of mind in France today, because of the lies propagated by the radio, the official press, and the declarations of the Government. I shall try to express it here, inasmuch as my information, limited to a few regions of the so-called free zone, may give a faithful picture.

On the morrow of the defeat, French opinion remained at first dumbfounded by the surprise and the suffering caused by the disaster. Desperate over the idea that our army, considered the best in the world, had so rapidly collapsed, our people did not believe that a resistance on the part of the Allies might effectively last. Reynaud's plan to abandon the country and to continue the struggle from the colonies was approved only by a minority; the bulk of the nation thought of nothing but saving what could be salvaged, and of preserving a portion of the territory out of reach of the enemy in the hope that a work of reconstruction might be attempted there. Moreover, the presence of Pétain, hero of Verdun, the only humane general of the other war, who after the mutinies of 1917 had sympathized intelligently with the misery of the poilus, aroused the confidence of the war-veterans, and many were ready to give up for the moment all personal thinking, and to place their destiny in his hands.

This state of despondency paved the way for the success of the adventurer Laval, invisible leader of all the corrupted press which, with such periodicals as *Gringoire*, *Candide*, and *Je Suis Partout*, had already been for many years an instrument of Nazi Germany or of Fascist Italy. Supreme hope of a wealthy section of the Bourgeoisie which preferred Hitler to Leon Blum, and a defeat of France to a victory of democracy, Laval attempted, according to his own expression, to "take cover" behind the Marshal in order to deal a death-blow to the Republican régime and make it responsible for the defeat. He succeeded in his objective at the National Assem-

bly of Vichy, that unforgettable spectacle of vileness and servility, by exerting upon all the members of the Parliament, a pressure composed at once of promises and threats; promises, because he swore on his honor he was certain that an authoritarian government would obtain from Hitler the immediate evacuation of Paris; threats, because, declaring himself a partisan of the supremacy of the civil power, he presented as imminent a military coup d'état by Weygand; moreover, the Assembly was surrounded by a powerful cordon of troops, and the eighty who had the courage to vote nay expected to be arrested the same evening.

After the coup d'état, the authoritarian régime gradually established itself in France, but the people rapidly recovered; and as the events could be more clearly understood, an opposition arose, at first in the occupied zone, where in the presence of the enemy and of a few traitors who under its control preached the so-called collaboration, a true national unity asserted itself for resistance; then, little by little, as eyes were opened in the unoccupied zone.

1. First, as the demobilized soldiers were returning home, people were no longer satisfied with the oversimplified explanation which attributed the disaster to the defects, real as they were, of the parliamentary régime. Having the opportunity to travel rather often, I overheard on the trains stories being told openly, without fear, amidst general approbation, stories of soldiers abandoned by their officers, of artillery-provisioners refusing to deliver material necessary to the fighting units, of inexplicable orders and counter-orders, of unequal distribution of a material which was not as scarce as one would have believed, of other errors showing a heavy responsibility on the part of the high staff; stories which always pointed to the same conclusion: "We have not been defeated, we have been betrayed." A tragic conclusion, but one which gives back to the average Frenchman a little confidence in himself with the feeling that he was not truly and fairly vanquished.

2. Furthermore, a change of attitude is manifested towards England, which last summer was generally criticized by all, in particular, it must be recognized,



by most of those who had fought at Dunkirk; the incident of Mers El Kebir had profoundly shocked opinion, which of course did not know all the details of the engagement. The German army of occupation impressed certain types of Frenchmen. There were one or two months in which the idea of collaboration might have been spread. Today, all that is a matter of the past. The amazing tenacity of the English people, stoical under bombardment, at first aroused general admiration; then the continuous psychological errors of the Germans did the rest—the division of France into separate zones, the suppression of mail, cutting family ties, the quasi-absolute interdiction of travel from one zone to the other, the vexations of which the war-prisoners are the victims, the systematic pillage of our entire economy—all these facts are opening from day to day the eyes of the most obtuse, the very people who are deeply Anglophobe, the naval circles loyal to old traditions, the wealthy classes which fear above all the return of a democratic system that would threaten their privileges, all feel an ever-increasing hatred of Nazi Germany which surpasses any other consideration. The British radio is religiously listened to every evening, every one clings to it as the only reliable source of information. The recent attacks of the Vichy radio have only served to strengthen this trend, and both the weakness of its diatribes and the mistakes of syntax which may often be detected in them, easily betray a poor translation from German; it may be safely said that General de Gaulle is today the recognized leader of the large majority of the French.

3. This statement does not mean that general opinion is aroused against Marshal Pétain; his past as well as his grandfatherly attitude retain for the moment the respect of all, and the loyal affection of most people, even when one is a little irritated by the superabundance of his pictures, of his historic words, of all the artificial means used to excite a leadership entirely foreign to the French mind. In spite of all that, for the time being, opinion supports him, and has ever since November 10th when he ousted that impostor Laval. Many people try to justify their devotion for both de Gaulle and Pétain, one leading

the struggle abroad, the other resisting as much as possible at home; they remark the moderation with which Pétain spoke against de Gaulle (whose name was not even pronounced), his frequent allusions to the day when France will become free again; they note that the Government has taken under German pressure abominable measures (status of the Jews, abolition of liberties, the camp of Gurs, the increasing seizure by the enemy of our industry), but they think that for the moment the essential remains safe. As long as Pétain remains firm on the two fundamental questions: North Africa, and the Fleet, opinion will support him; if he yields or if he accepts the return of Laval to the Government, he will lose face and all his popularity will vanish in an instant.

As for Vichy, most of the ministers, and the administrations within each ministry, are in continual strife. Each one looks out for his own interests, conflicts of authority are everywhere, and finally, as the most trivial question never receives an answer before three months, nobody waits for it, and everybody does as he pleases. It is the régime of an "hierarchized anarchy." What is most serious for the future is that the present administration as a whole is spoiling by its defective methods a number of good ideas. Opinion reacts to such an experiment in controlled economy with an exacerbation of individualism which will have to be overcome later. The excessive pre-eminence given to the Roman Catholic Church reawakens among the masses a tradition of anti-clericalism which has been dozing for years. The lies spread by the radio and the official press risk creating a habit of criticism and of systematic scepticism.

Public meetings are prohibited now, clubs are dissolved, the press is strangled. It does not matter. The Frenchman has never obeyed laws much anyway. He will not start today. Under the edicts and the servile declarations of Vichy, life rekindles among the people of France, a people who remain free in thought and instinct, who dress their wounds and await in silent recollection the moment to resume the struggle.

## The World Church: News and Notes

### California Clergy Vote on War

It is reported by the field secretary, Mr. Guy Talbott, that the Pacific Coast office of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches recently sent a questionnaire to five hundred ministers of all denominations in California, to ascertain their views regarding current war issues. Here are the questions and the answers in terms of percentages.

1. Do you think the United States should participate in the present war as an ally of Britain and China? YES 50% NO 50%
2. Do you think the United States should offer its services now in attempting a "negotiated peace"? YES 52% NO 48%
3. Do you favor embargoes

# CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion  
601 West 120th Street, New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
Chairman	FRANCIS P. MILLER
JOHN C. BENNETT	EDWARD L. PARSONS
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
JOHN A. MACKAY	

against shipment of war materials to Japan?

YES 91% NO 9%

4. Do you favor U. S. membership in a revised League of Nations, with economic and military power to prevent aggression?

YES 90% NO 10%

5. Do you believe absolute pacifism is the best answer to Hitlerism?

YES 28% NO 72%

## Conscientious Objectors

The International Christian Press Service reports that the first group of conscientious objectors, assigned to work of national importance in lieu of military service, has been sent to camps for alternate service. The religious groups are financing the maintenance, administration, education, and religious programme.

Sixty-three different denominations are represented among the registrants. Mennonites represent the largest group with nearly one fourth of the total. Other churches with large representation include Brethren, Friends, Methodists, Baptists, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Disciples of Christ, Congregationalists, and Christian Evangelicals.

## The Orphaned Missions

Over a million dollars has been raised by the churches of various nations for missionary work which has been orphaned by the war, that is, cut off from the home churches. Of this amount \$925,749 has been raised in the United States. \$553,000 of this total has been contributed to missions of the continental churches, while \$442,000 has been used to assist British missionary work. Canada has raised \$24,000 for orphaned missions. On the basis of incomplete returns, Britain, continental nations, particularly Sweden and Switzerland, and Australia, New Zealand and South Africa have contributed approximately \$110,000 for the same purpose.

Public Library  
Woodward & Kirby Aves.  
Detroit, Mich.

650 12-41

## The Church of Scotland

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, meeting the end of May, passed a resolution declaring that "admitting the need for a confession of personal and national shortcomings, we are firmly confident that God has committed to our nation, in spite of many shortcomings, a righteous cause which He can bless."

## Communication

Sirs:

Your leading editorial, "Allied Peace Aims," indicates a most unrealistic approach to a serious problem. It suggests a state of mind in the author closely akin to that of the so-called Christian pacifists who must bear a large share of the burden of responsibility for the present situation. The article is based upon the false supposition that 'Hitlerism' is something new and unique. It is in fact nothing but a recurring manifestation of what seem to be basic faults inherent in the German make-up. Under the leadership of one man or another, they have drenched Europe in blood time and again—three times within the memory of living men.

I am one of the A.E.F. that "returned from Europe with a strong conviction that peace should have been made in Berlin." The article criticizes that attitude. I am more than ever convinced that the attitude was right. If peace had been made in Berlin and its terms enforced by whatever means were necessary, the seven years' preparation which Germany made for the present war would have been impossible.

The unilateral exercise of power does not, as the article states, give security a 'precarious foundation.' It is about the one thing that gives security a firm foundation. We enjoy domestic tranquillity only by virtue of the unilateral exercise of power vested in one class of society and imposed upon the other through the medium of policemen. We all look forward to the day when human understanding will be such that the use of force will be unnecessary. Until that day comes, we must recognize the existence of international gangsters and restrain their activities as we do the depredations of the local gangsters—by force. Efforts to reform them should be continuous, but, pending reform they must be restrained. This restraint must be exercised by the decent people of the world and imposed upon the gangsters whether they like it or not. A 'just' peace must be just to the good people of the world, and not merely allow complete freedom of action to the wicked. An Anglo-American peace *would* be a real peace, your author to the contrary notwithstanding.

WILLIAM D. CAMERON  
Tuckahoe, New York

*However necessary it may be to disarm Germany in the event of her defeat and to maintain unilateral power in a provisional period, we cannot see that the problem of Europe will be solved by turning the continent into a vast jail and making a permanent distinction between "gangster nations" and their jailers. This has been tried before and proved futile.*

The Editors

